UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/640,478	08/16/2000	Avinash C. Saxena	066241.0111	4549

7590 05/02/2006

Baker Botts LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER	
BATES, KEVIN T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/640,478	SAXENA, AVINASH C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Bates	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 April 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on April 10, 2006.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (6389460) in view of Periyannan (6587928).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Stewart teaches a method for communicating data comprising:

establishing at a cache server a first uniform resource identifier and a header portion associated with a first content item (Column 6, lines 55 – 62; Column 4, lines 56 – 57; lines 35 – 37);

caching a second content item corresponding to the first content item (Column 4, lines 43 – 50), the second content item identified by a second uniform resource identifier (Column 6, lines 11 – 22; Column 3, lines 30 – 35; Column 11, lines 13 – 25), the second uniform resource identifier comprising the first uniform resource identifier and information from the header portion (Column 4, lines 38 – 41);

receiving a first request at the cache server, the first request requesting the first content item, the first request comprising the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion (Column 4, lines 35 – 37);

a specific transform defining an action to perform on the first uniform resource identify and the header portion (Column 8, lines 54 – 66, wherein the transform is adding the header information and URL into an image identification string);

generating a second request based on the criteria, the header portion, and the first uniform resource identifier, the second request being associated with the second content item, the second request generated by combining information from the header portion and the first uniform resource identifier to yield the second uniform resource identifier (Column 4, lines 56 – 66); and

retrieving the second content item based on the second uniform resource identifier of the second request (Column 5, lines 1 – 4).

Stewart does not explicitly indicate comparing the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to criteria to identify a specific transform associated with the first uniform resource identify.

Periyannan teaches a caching system for content requests that includes a comparison of the received URL and header information with a transform criteria to determine whether the request should be passed to the data cache or forwarded straight on to the content server (Column 4, lines 59 – 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Periyannan's teaching in Stewarts' system in order to

identify whether the requested object is cacheable before performing Stewart's URL transformation and cache check because it will cut down on the wasted requests to the cache server for objects that are not going located there.

Regarding claim 2 and 12, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 1 and 11, wherein: the header portion comprises a hypertext transport protocol header portion; and comparing the first uniform resource identifier and the header portion to predefined criteria further comprises; examining a hypertext transport protocol identifier portion associated with the first content item; comparing the hypertext transport protocol identifier portion to the criteria; examining the hypertext transport protocol header portion associated with the first request; and comparing the hypertext transport protocol header portion to the criteria (Column 4, lines 55 – 66; Column 8, lines 46 – 49).

Regarding claims 3 and 13, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 2 and 12, wherein the predefined criteria comprises match criteria and an associated transform (Column 8, lines 46 – 49; Column 4, lines 57 – 63).

Regarding claims 4 and 14, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 3 and 13, wherein the transform comprises at least one rule indicating how to modify the hypertext transport protocol identifier portion associated with the first request to generate the second request (Column 11, line 64 – Column 12, line 8).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 3 and 13, wherein the transform comprises at least one rule

indicating an element associated with the hypertext transport protocol header portion of the first request to be associated with the hypertext transport protocol identifier portion of the second request (Column 12, lines 5 – 19).

Regarding claims 6 and 16, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 3 and 13, wherein the match criteria comprises at least one entry, each entry comprising a portion of a hypertext transport protocol identifier and comparing the hypertext transport protocol identifier portion to the criteria comprises comparing each entry to the hypertext transport protocol identifier portion of the first request (Column 9, lines 11 – 24).

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 1 and 11, wherein retrieving the second content item comprises: retrieving the second content item based on the second request from the cache server when the second content item is available from the cache server (Column 9, lines 32 – 46; Column 11, lines 13 – 26); and retrieving the first content item based on the first request from the origin server when the second content item is unavailable from the cache server (Column 9, lines 46 – 55; Column 7, lines 58 – 62).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 7 and 17, wherein the second content item is related to the first content item (Column 10, lines 14 – 25).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 7 and 17, wherein the second content item comprises a

version of the first content item customized in response to data in the header portion associated with the first request (Column 12, lines 5 – 6).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Stewart teaches the method for communicating data according to claims 1 and 11, wherein generating the second request comprises: adding a hypertext transport protocol identifier portion of the first request to a hypertext transport protocol identifier portion of the second request; and associating an element associated with the header portion associated with the first request with the hypertext transport protocol identifier portion of the second request (Column 4, lines 56 – 66).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 10, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that reference, Periyannan, does not disclose comparing the first uniform resource identifier to transform criteria to identify a specific transform associated with the URI. The examiner disagrees, the reference Stewart discloses a specific transform to perform on a URI if the object is cache-able, but doesn't indicate comparing the URI to transform criteria. Periyannan teaches a system that determines actions to be taken on web objects based on URI requests that include comparing the object and URI to conditions such as if the object is cache-able or not. The combination of Periyannan with Stewart teaches the idea that the system makes a determination whether the transform conditions are met, which is whether the object is cache-able or not.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
April 28, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER